



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. Box 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
WWW.USPTO.GOV

Paper No. None

Thomas J. Tighe, Esq.  
Suite 103  
6265 Greenwich Drive  
San Diego CA 92122-5916

**COPY MAILED**

**SEP 11 2006**

|                                |   |                            |
|--------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| In re Application of           | : | <b>OFFICE OF PETITIONS</b> |
| Norm Pressley                  | : |                            |
| Application No. 10/634,363     | : | DECISION ON PETITION       |
| Filed: August 4, 2003          | : | UNDER 37 C.F.R. \$1.181    |
| Attorney Docket No.: 5462 PA01 | : |                            |
| Title: PUTTER ALIGNMENT        | : |                            |
| TRAINING SYSTEM                | : |                            |

This is a decision on the petition filed on July 24, 2006, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. \$1.181, requesting that the holding of abandonment in the above-identified application be withdrawn.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the Notice Regarding Drawings, mailed September 16, 2005, which set a period for reply of two months. No response was received, and no extensions of time under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. \$1.136(a) were requested. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on November 17, 2005. A notice of abandonment was mailed on June 15, 2006.

With the present petition, Petitioner has alleged that the mailing was not received. The showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner stating that the Office communication was not received by the practitioner and attesting to the fact that a search of the file jacket and docket records indicates that the Office communication was not received. In addition, a copy of the docket record where the non-received Office communication would have been entered had it been received and docketed must be attached to and referenced in practitioner's statement<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> See MPEP 711.03(c).

Petitioner has met the requirements of Delgar v. Schuyler, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971), in that he has asserted that he has searched both the file jacket and the docket record, and he has included a copy of the latter.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the delay at issue, as set forth on petition, it is concluded that Petitioner has met his burden of establishing that the mailing was not received.

Accordingly, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181(a) is GRANTED. The holding of abandonment is WITHDRAWN.

The Office of Patent Publication will be notified of this decision. The Office of Patent Publication will review the drawings submitted with the present petition.

Telephone inquiries regarding this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3225<sup>2</sup>. All other inquiries concerning examination procedures or status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.



Paul Shanoski  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions  
United States Patent and Trademark Office

---

<sup>2</sup> Petitioner will note that all practice before the Office should be in writing, and the action of the Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. See 37 C.F.R. §1.2. As such, Petitioner is reminded that no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for Petitioner's further action(s).